

REMARKS

This communication is responsive to the Office Action mailed May 24, 2005.

Claims 1, 3 and 7-11 are rejected based on the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Claims 2, 4-6 and 12 are objected to. In response to a message left for the Examiner, the Examiner left a message for the undersigned on July 1 clarifying that claims 2, 4-6 and 12 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form.

By this response, Applicant has rewritten claim 1 to incorporate the features previously in claim 2, and claim 2 has been cancelled. Thus, claim 1 is in allowable form. Claim 4 has been amended to depend from amended claim 1, and claims 3, 5 and 7-11 remain dependent on claim 1. Thus, claims 1, 3-5 and 7-11 are in allowable form.

Claims 6 and 12 have each been rewritten in independent form, to include the features in claim 1, before claim 1 was amended. Thus, claims 6 and 12 are in allowable form.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Alan S. Hodes
Reg. No. 38, 185

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300